

In re Application of: Chavez et al.  
Serial Number: 09/607,374

A1 58. A computer as in claim 57, wherein the user interface provided by the help application includes an interface element presenting an option to view index strings of the help topics.

59. A computer as in claim 58, wherein the help contents of the help topics are written in a mark-up language.

---

#### REMARKS

The Office Action of January 15, 2003 has been carefully reviewed along with the cited references. In view of the foregoing amendments the following remarks, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance.

The Office Action imposed a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121. Specifically, the Office Action divided the claims into the following Groups:

- I. Claims 1-26 and 38-39, drawn to providing help information;
- II. Claims 27-37, drawn to updating existing help information in a database.

As stated in the Office Action, applicants' attorney made a provisional election of Group I.

Applicants hereby affirm that election. Accordingly, claims 27-37 in Group II have been cancelled.

The Office Action objected to claims 2, 5, 18, 22, and 24 for the form of these claims. In view of the cancellation of these claims, that objection is now moot.

The Office Action also objected to the drawings for the reason that reference number 88 in Fig. 2, reference number 112 in FIG. 2, and reference number 130 in FIG. 6 are not mentioned in the description. Applicants note, however, that reference numbers 112 and 130 are mentioned at page 15, line 13 and page 19, line 27, respectively, of the specification. There is therefore no

In re Application of: Chavez et al.  
Serial Number: 09/607,374

correction required for FIGS. 3 and 6. As to the reference number 88, applicants have amended the specification to include the reference number 88, thereby obviating the need to amend FIG. 2.

Turning now to the claim rejections, the Office Action rejected claims 1-26, 38, and 39 based on the NetHelp 2.0 Authoring Guide (hereinafter NetHelp) either alone or in combination with U.S. Patent 5,825,356 to Habib et al., U.S. Patent 6,185,587 to Bernardo et al., and/or the "Netscape Object Signing" article. Since these claims have now been canceled in favor of the new claims 40-59, the rejections are now moot.

Applicants submit the new claims 40-59 should be allowable over the cited references. The present invention is directed to a framework for integrating help topics available for the various software and hardware components installed on a computer, such that the help topics provided by different software and hardware vendors can all be presented and viewed through a common user interface. Moreover, in accordance with the invention, the set of help topics are extensible so that new help topics can be added, and existing help topic can be moved or removed automatically. These issues are addressed by the framework of the invention as now claimed in independent claims 40 and 50.

In contrast, the NetHelp reference, which is the primary reference relied upon by the Office Action for the rejections, is a program for helping a user to create on-line help contents by filling out templates. It does not address the issue of integrating help topics and help contents provided by different vendors of the software and hardware components of the computer. Nor does it provide any mechanism to allow the computer to extend or modify the on-line help contents created by the user. Thus, NetHelp does not teach or suggest the use of a content store to separately store the help contents from different vendors, and the use of a help database to provide mapping information for the various help topics from different sources to integrate the help topics into one taxonomy structure for user interface, as recited in the claims. NetHelp also does not teach or suggest the use

In re Application of: Chavez et al.  
Serial Number: 09/607,374

of an update module to modify the content store or the help database to add, move, or remove help topics and contents. Since NetHelp is not directed to the issues addressed by the invention and does not teach or suggest these limitations, it by itself or in combination with the other references could not have anticipated or rendered obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 40 and 50 should be allowable. The other new claims all depend from claims 40 and 50, respectively, and should therefore also be allowable.

**Conclusion:**

Accordingly, this application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Y. Kurt Chang, Reg. No. 41,397  
One of the Attorneys for Applicant  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 10, 2003